ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 8/12/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ACCESSION NUMBER: ED000485
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: 7236
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.: N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Berry, Charles A. and Smith, Arthur D.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: A College Looks at Its Student Teaching Program

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Grambling College
ST. Grambling,
CITY, STATE Louisiana
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Grambling College

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	59	9

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Self-Study

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

	faculty	professional education		
supervision	teacher education	interinstitutional	cooperation	
teachers	field instruction			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Self-evaluation study of student teaching program conducted by the Division of Education of Grambling College in cooperation with offcampus schools connected with its student teaching program. Cooperating teachers, supervisors, and principals completed a checklist dealing with: the basic structure of the program; the preparation of the student teacher; supervisory activities of cooperating teachers; professional benefit derived from the program by cooperating teachers; and an evaluation of certain practices such as payment of stipend to cooperating teachers, more frequent visits by college supervisors, and more conferences between college supervisors and cooperating teachers.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

IV- 18 (Teacher Ta

"A COLLEGE LOOKS AT ITS STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM,"

Charles A. Berry and
Arthur D. Smith.

This project was undertaken in accord with the widely recognized fact that a self-evaluation is a most useful instrument for the improvement of an educational program. The Division of Education of Grambling College thought that it would be good procedure to enlist the cooperation of the off-campus schools connected with its student teaching program because the training of teachers is a joint enterprise involving close communication and coordination of efforts between the personnel of the college and the public schools that provide for an extension of the pre-service training into the more realistic experience offered by assignment to duties in a school and community that are removed from the immediate college environment. It is also true that this kind of self-evaluation would enable a college faculty to look at its efforts through the eyes of cooperating teachers, principals, and supervisors and perhaps gain some insights into the quality (or lack of quality) in its program of student teaching that may not be attained under a more restricted self-evaluation.

The basic philosophy underlying the self-evaluation was the idea that student teaching should be primarily a learning experience and not a period of trial during which college supervisors and cooperating teachers, principals and supervisors just sit in judgment and offer little or no assistance as the budding young

ED000485
6/30/60

Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana

teacher goes through his ordeal. On this point Calvin S. Sifferd has said: "Practice teaching is probably the most difficult period in the career of the budding teacher. To be thrown into a classroom situation, often in the middle of a semester, is a trying circumstance, even for an experienced substitute teacher. The pupils know that the practice teacher is on trial; the regular teacher is in the back of the room making notes. The practice teacher knows the regular teacher wants the class work continued in the established pattern and is often afraid to make any changes, yet usually he does not know just what those patterns are. With all this strangeness about him and the feeling that he is before a judge and jury, there are often added trials and discouragements... If we need practice teaching as a part of the teacher training curriculum, then we should take steps to make practice teaching a learning experience instead of a trial."[1]

The literature on student teaching makes frequent reference to the idea that cooperating schools and cooperating teachers reap benefits from having pre-service teachers assigned to them for an apprenticeship. Such benefits as enriched programs of activities and the stimulation of professional growth on the part of the regular teachers rank high on the list.

---

[1]Sifferd, Calvin S., "Need Practice Teaching Be Discouraging?", Phi Delta Kappan, 32:283-84, May 1951.

Our purpose then for making this study was to seek answers to such questions as these: What are the strong and the weak points in our student teaching program in terms of providing a satisfactory learning experience for pre-service teachers? What do the persons participating in the program interpret their roles to be? Are the schools and communities that participate in the program receiving the benefits that should be expected, or is student teaching just an added burden? What are the specific steps we need to take to remedy defects in our program and further improve the pre-service training of teachers during this phase of their preparation.

Teachers and principals at the Grambling High School, Grambling Elementary School, Lincoln High School, and Lincoln Elementary School were not included in the study because they were considered to be laboratory schools. The study was further limited in scope to include only those teachers, principals and supervisors who were actively engaged in the student teaching program during the 1958-59 spring semester. However, most of these had been used during several semesters and therefore were in good position to make realistic appraisals. The number of specific items in the checklist used was held to a reasonable minimum, but they were chosen so as to be broadly representative of the general features of a student teaching program.

A copy of the checklist for evaluating the student teaching program was sent to 115 cooperating teachers and 15 supervisors and principals. Completed copies of the checklist were received

from 104 cooperating teachers and 11 principals and supervisors. The large percentage of returned questionnaires, 92 per cent of those sent to teachers and 85 per cent of those sent to principals and supervisors, led the writers to feel that the data secured for the study were quite representative of the attitudes and feeling of cooperating teachers and administrators regarding the program.

The checklist was divided basically into three parts and was constructed on a five-point scale. The first part, consisting of 13 items, was concerned with the basic structure, organization and operation of the student teaching program. The second part of the checklist was concerned with the personal, academic, and professional preparation of the student teachers. This part consisted of 17 items. In addition, and perhaps of great importance to the college, the respondents were asked to identify the three items on each of parts one and two that they felt were most in need of improvement. Part three was divided into three sections which were concerned with (1) the nature and extent of supervisory activities of cooperating teachers, (2) the extent to which the student teaching program was of professional benefit to the cooperating teacher and (3) the relative merit certain practices would have for the student teaching program.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The general feeling of the respondents, both cooperating teachers and administrators, was that the student teaching program

was well organized and administered. The categorical percentage of responses by teachers for the items concerned with the general structure and organization of the program was as follows:

Rating	Per Cent
Superior	39.7
Good	52.9
Fair	6.7
Inferior	.2
Poor	.5

Some items in the checklist were concerned in the main with the role that the college, through its own supervisors of student teaching, assumed in the operation of the student teaching program. It was possible to tabulate the responses of the cooperating teachers and get a picture of their evaluation of the supervisory role of the college.

The composite responses in percentage given by the cooperating teachers on these items were as follows:

Rating	Per Cent
Superior	22.3
Good	51.6
Fair	20.0
Inferior	3.4
Poor	2.8

Of particular note perhaps were the responses concerning (1) the frequency of observation; (2) the nature of the information regarding student teachers sent to cooperating teachers; (3) the time that such information is sent; (4) the amount of assistance given

student teachers by college supervisors as a result of their observation; and (5) the timing of the observation. More than 25 per cent of the cooperating teachers rated the program fair, inferior and poor in the above respects.

Two of the items requested the respondents to rate the techniques used in evaluating the growth of student teachers during their student teaching experiences. Approximately 31 per cent of the teachers felt that the program was superior in this respect, while 63 per cent and 6 per cent felt it to be good and fair respectively.

An attempt was made to find out the impressions of the cooperating teachers regarding the academic, personal and professional preparation of student teachers as these qualities and traits were manifested in their teaching. The cumulative percentage breakdown of responses to items regarding the preparation of student teachers is as follows:

	Category of Preparation		
Rating	Academic	Personal	Professional
Superior	100.0	100.0	100.0
Good	67.8	61.6	67.4
Fair	30.5	22.9	23.3
Inferior	5.0	6.0	3.5
Poor	3.0	2.4	2.3

The above data suggest perhaps that these student teachers were better prepared by way of academic qualifications to assume the responsibilities inherent in student teaching than in their personal and professional qualifications. When, however, the

various items bearing on their preparation for student teaching were analyzed, the findings became even more significant. For example, 37 per cent of the student teachers were rated no higher than fair in speech fluency; 36 per cent of the student teachers were rated no higher than fair in sense of humor; while 34 per cent and 30 per cent of them were rated fair and poorer in terms of originality and creativity, and resourcefulness respectively. Quite significant also was the fact that 85 per cent or more of the co-operating teachers rated the student teacher as good and superior in their manifestation of each of the following tratis:

1. Interest in pupils
2. Interest in rapid learners
3. Likableness
4. Receptivity to suggestions
5. Fairness in grading

Although 14 per cent of the student teachers were rated fair and poorer on "Interest in rapid learners," 26 per cent of them were rated fair and poorer on "Interest in slow learners."

An attempt was made through the checklist to determine the importance the cooperating teachers attached to their own supervisory activities. These findings showed that cooperating teachers generally attached great significance to the professional role that a cooperating teacher should assume in helping student teachers grow and develop in their profession. It may be pointed out, however, that the data tended to show that the cooperating teachers did not feel that it was as important for them to help student

teachers with their personal and social problems as with other problems, perhaps of a more professional nature, such as planning, classroom management, selection and utilization of materials, demonstrating good teaching techniques, etc.

Three of the items in the checklist attempted to discover the extent to which these cooperating teachers felt that the program had stimulated their professional growth. Their evaluation of this aspect of the student teaching program is listed below:

Rating	Per Cent
Most important	55.7
Very important	31.1
Moderately important	10.0
Relatively unimportant	1.0
Undesirable	2.1

Finally, an attempt was made to ascertain the relative merit certain practices would have for improving the student teaching program. The practices and the responses (given in per cent) of the cooperating teachers follow:

	Payment of stipend to cooperating teachers	More frequent visits by college supervisors	More conferences between college supervisors and cooperating teachers
Most important	40.0	38.0	54.3
Very important	26.7	46.0	35.9
Moderately important	13.3	12.6	9.8
Relatively unimportant	5.6	3.4	0.0
Undesirable	14.4	0.0	0.0

The respondents were asked to identify in terms of their importance the facets of the student teaching program that were most in need of improvement. Below are listed in order of importance those facets of the program judged most in need of improvement.

1. Nature of information about student teachers sent to cooperating teachers
2. The time that such information is sent
3. Frequency of observation by college supervisors
4. Amount of information given student teachers as a result of observation by college supervisor
5. The timing of observation by college supervisors
6. Institution's interpretation of program to cooperating teachers
7. Nature of assistance given student teachers by college supervisors when they observed

Cooperating teachers were asked also to identify, in terms of their importance, those academic, personal and professional qualities in student teachers that were most in need of improvement. Their reactions in order of rank are given below:

1. Understanding pupils
2. Originality and creativity
3. Interest in slow learners
4. Speech fluency
5. Resourcefulness
6. Knowledge of subject matter
7. Sense of humor

It is the opinion of the writers that the results of this study are significant in helping to identify strengths and weaknesses in the student teaching program of the college and in their implications for specific steps that should be taken for improvement.